


Official

LAW OFFICES OF ALBERT S. MICHALIK, PLLC

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

To: EXAMINER DIEU-MINH THAI LE	From: John S. Jardine
FAX NUMBER: (703) 746-7239	Date: April 1, 2003
COMPANY: Law Offices of Albert S. Michalik, PLLC	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER: 10
PHONE NUMBER: (425) 467-5686	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER: Serial No. 09/360,542
Re: DRAFT RESPONSE for Serial No. 09/360,542. Please call when you receive this so that we can schedule an examiner's interview	YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER: Attorney Docket No. 2110

☐ URGENT ☒ FOR REVIEW ☐ PLEASE COMMENT ☐ PLEASE REPLY ☐ PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTES/COMMENTS:

Examiner LE:

Attached you will find a **DRAFT RESPONSE** for the above-identified application outlining the issues I wish to discuss during the examiner's interview. Please call me at (425) 467-5686 when you receive this so that we can schedule an examiner's interview.

I look forward to talking with you.

Sincerely,

John S. Jardine, Reg. No. 48,835

704 - 228TH AVENUE NE • SUITE 193 • SAMMAMISH, WA 98074
PHONE: (425) 467-5686 • FAX: (425) 462-6746

DRAFT ONLY—NOT FOR ENTRY
In re Application of CABRERA et al.
Serial No. 09/360,542

DRAFT ONLY – NOT FOR ENTRY

PATENT
Attorney Docket No. 2110

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

CABRERA et al.

Group Art Unit: 2184

Serial No. 09/360,542

Examiner: LE, D. M. T.

Filed: July 26, 1999

For: Automated System Recovery Via Backup
and Restoration of System State

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

This communication is a response to the Office Action dated November 18, 2002. Please consider the following remarks, which applicants submit places the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Applicants further submit that these remarks do not raise any new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

REMARKS

The Office Action of November 18, 2002 ("the Office Action"), which was made final, has been carefully considered. In the Office Action, claims 1-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §